

moving potential parents, lowers the population by reducing the birth rate (p. 312).

Another interesting general problem on which this volume of reports adds a useful collection of opinions is that of the cash value loss to a country of its emigrants. The authorities recognize the uncertainty in all such estimates; but M. Boule quotes the calculations that a French labourer at the age of twenty years is worth 34,000 francs, and an engineer 350,000 francs; and at the age of forty the values are 27,000 for a labourer and 490,000 francs for an engineer. Dr. F. Burgdörfer, in the chapter on German migration—which is the longest and, owing to the special complexity of German migration conditions, one of the most valuable in the volume—discusses the cash value of the six million German emigrants; he calculates that in 1881-90, each 100,000 emigrants represented a value of 301,156,000 marks and the total loss to Germany of the overseas emigration between 1820 and 1926 was 182,048 millions of marks, or, say, £90,000,000,000.

Such estimates leave out of account the influence of the immigrants as commercial agents for the land of their birth, and their contribution to its prosperity by raising for it increased supplies of raw material, and enlarging the market for its manufactures. One of the most discouraging features at present is that the collapse of overseas migration from Europe is weakening the financial stability of those countries which depend on exports for their prosperity.

J. W. GREGORY.

Field, James A. *Essays on Population and Other Papers by James Alfred Field, together with Material from His Notes and Lectures compiled and edited by Helen Fisher Hohman, with a foreword by James Bonar, LL.D.* Chicago, 1931. University of Chicago Press. Pp. xxix+440. Price \$3.50.

THIS volume, by one of the greatest demographers America has produced, is a notable

contribution to population thought and its history. An original, meticulously accurate scholar, Field has, unfortunately, been little known to European, and especially to Continental scholars. It is a great service, therefore, that one of his students should collect his more important scattered papers and notes, and edit them so ably. The solidity of the volume is matched by a felicity of literary presentation rarely found among economic writers; a combination especially refreshing in this day in America when, with growing numbers in our colleges, almost every underpaid professor becomes the hack author of a dull, poorly-written text-book.

The range of topics is wide. Part I contains twelve essays on eugenics, birth control, and Malthusianism, the treatment being essentially historical and critical. Part II collects three papers on economics and statistics, while Part III is a catalogue of the author's library on population. Since the *Dictionary of American Biography* has failed to include the career of Field, it is fitting that the editor has added a short biography together with a distinctive photograph of the author.

I have always felt—perhaps there is a personal bias—that Essay III on "The Early Propagandist Movement in English Population Theory" was the best paper Field ever published. I know of no finer example of historico-economic research in the English language, no matter what tests are applied. Though Professor Graham Wallas deserves credit also, it is not an ungenerous distinction to say that Field was the first scholar to appraise in full measure Francis Place's efforts for birth control at the beginning of the last century. Much of the Place correspondence which Dr. Stopes has upon various occasions claimed to have "discovered" was known to, and used by, Field.

Essays IV, V, and IX are specifically on eugenics. They are Galtonian in idealism; but the author is mindful of the numerous difficulties. The article reprinted from the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* is an excellent historical and critical review of euge-

nical literature produced up to the time of publication (1911). Regrettably, the author never followed it up.

Field worried much (see the chapter on "Paradoxes of Population Problems") about getting eugenical worth well rewarded economically. But I cannot see that, for all his metaphysics, he has brought us any nearer the solution. However, he poses thought-provoking questions:

"Eugenics speaks the language of ultimate goals; life in economic society is living in terms of proximate goals, and its rewards are in terms of immediate, individual advantage. Is it possible, or logical, to set up ultimate goals which are not related to the prizes for which men strive? What is wrong with an ideal in which every one pursues his immediate advantage?" (p. 287).

"Does eugenics offer a method by which poverty may be eliminated?"

Can any stock be considered eugenically fit, even though economically successful, if it does not perpetuate itself? (p. 288).

Such are some of his queries.

The chapter on "Eugenic Worth and Economic Value" is unconvincing and vague. Field not infrequently poses unreal "contradictions" and "distinctions." The distinction (p. 318) between "poverty" and the "sense of poverty," even if valid, seems hair-splitting and irrelevant to the discussion. For Field is arguing against a self-erected strawman when he says that universalized birth control will not reduce the *sense* of poverty. I am not aware that anyone ever said it would. The person who is not poor, but who thinks he is, is a problem not for the economist, but for the psychiatrist. To say that giving such people contraceptive information would not solve their problems of mental health is hardly profound. One may, however, agree with the thesis of this chapter that economic success is not always a sign of eugenic fitness; and that "between current eugenic programmes and the actual economic setting . . . there are indications of a real contrariety in principle" (pp. 247-8).

The various essays on the history of Malthusian thought and criticism show a thorough, first-hand knowledge of the numerous British commentators. Opinions will differ whether Malthus has too much overshadowed the scene in the discussion of population problems during the past half century or more; or whether, after all, the small fry collectively had little to say that was valid.

Field studied their works more intensively than I think they were worth; but it is well that someone has performed this useful task at least once. Now the American text-book writers will have more grist for their mill. Judging by the published writings of the two demographers, Field seems to have differed from Dr. Bonar in at least this respect: that the former thought the works of the commentators worthy of careful study.

Regarding birth control Field made this prophecy:

"It has spread because it meets a personal need. . . . If the race is threatened with extinction, or eugenics proves the policy to be wrong, or the world witnesses a return to a naïve religious belief, it is conceivable that the movement may weaken; but it is more probable that in the next generation it will spread and in time will establish itself as moral and even obligatory. Blind persecution will only increase its notoriety and spread the practice as it has done repeatedly in the past. The real choice to be made now is, not whether we shall have the practice of birth-control at all, but whether we shall have it practised admittedly and by the methods which have been found by experiment to be best fitted to our purposes, or whether we shall have it carried on furtively by informal and untested methods circulated by the unreliable tongue of gossip." (p. 328. Composed by the editor from lectures delivered in 1923-4.).

Field was at once a participator in, and detached observer of, the birth-control movement. He was the first president of the

Illinois Birth Control League, one of the most energetic leagues in the U.S.A., and which operates six thriving clinics in Chicago. It might have been useful had the editor included in this volume a summary of Field's testimony at the Hearings before Senate Judiciary Committee on the Cummins-Vaile Bill in Washington during 1924.

The author's statements on birth control were usually cautious—because (1) he was critically minded; because (2) he wrote at an early period (from the academic standpoint); and because (3) he usually addressed mixed university classes. But he was occasionally outspoken, as when he upbraided the medical profession for deserting the public when they had a right to expect active leadership (p. 326). If he were writing to-day one doubts if he would say: "Birth control . . . is not ready for the masses. The intelligent responsibility which it assumes can be properly exercised only by the intellectually *élite*" (p. 317). It was a surprise to find him lapsing into an 'all or none' fallacy as when (p. 327) he ventures to suggest that contraceptive methods must be 100 per cent. reliable, or they are "valueless."

The work of both author and editor is, on the whole, so well executed that it would seem almost ungenerous to venture upon detailed criticisms. Yet I know Professor Field would not have wished otherwise. He was interested in the truth above all things. Perhaps the chief defect of the volume is a certain loss of timeliness by the delay in gathering together these papers. It is no criticism of the editor to say that they should have been published fifteen years ago. There were good reasons for the delay; besides his usual lecture duties at the University of Chicago, Professor Field edited for a number of years the *Journal of Political Economy*. Moreover, he had a perfectionist attitude towards the preparation of his papers. Like a true craftsman, he was never satisfied with what he did. He modestly underestimated the value to others of his contributions. Consequently the physical volume of his output suffered.

As a consequence of this postponement, the statistical tables are old, and many of the observations out of date; but the overwhelming body of the material is of permanent value. A small amount of repetition has been inevitable; it was necessary to maintain the unity of the papers, most of which had been previously published.

More serious has been the failure of the editor to square certain statements with the results of more recent research. Regarding the history of the birth-control movement, much of what has been said in several places about John Stuart Mill and Robert Owen is inaccurate. "H. M." (p. 39) (a typographical error for "A. M.") who contributed essays favouring birth control to the *Black Dwarf* was John Stuart Mill. It is no criticism of Professor Field that he did not discover this; but the editor might well have straightened the matter out in a note, since the point was clarified in the *Economic Journal* (Historical Supplement, 1929, p. 476). That Place was wrong in alleging that Owen introduced the sponge method of contraception has been amply shown by the reviewer (see *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August, 1928). Yet erroneous statements about Owen appear on several pages (e.g. 98 ff., 49, 217).

The author gives undue weight to chance phrases in the first edition of Malthus' *Essay* in an effort to prove (p. 35 ff.) that Malthus recognized moral restraint in the first edition (1798). This discussion is singularly unconvincing. This does not mean that Malthus did not know that some people delayed marriage; but rather that Malthus did not tie this observation in with his general theory in the first edition.

Field does not seem to have known (p. 218) that the American movement began at New Harmony, Indiana, in 1828, two years before Robert Dale Owen published in New York his memorable *Moral Physiology*. The statement in Mrs. Besant's *Autobiography* to the effect that Cook interleaved obscene pictures in the copies of the Knowlton pamphlet is accepted implicitly (p. 219). No one has been able to check

this story; and my own investigations cast doubt upon its truth.

It is a widely held error (p. 132 and *passim*) that Galton was the founder of modern eugenics. This is true only in the sense that he did more for its systematic exposition than any other writer of the nineteenth century. But Charles Knowlton (1800-50) and Robert Dale Owen (1801-77) were as thorough-going in their support of eugenic ideals as Galton; indeed, they went further: they recognised contraception as one of the chief instruments by which at least the negative aspects might be achieved (see *Eugenics*, May, 1929). It should not dim the glory of Galton's name that lesser figures should have minor halos.

A few comments on the editing are in order. There is some laxity in punctuation in the portions written by the editor. In this respect there is a growing carelessness among American writers. Though it is a model of research, Field's treatment of the "Diabolical Handbill" episode is not "exhaustive," as the editor says (p. 49, note). It would help other investigators, if, when citing rare literature, the location were given by the author or editor. How well I remember spending hours, spread over six months, trying to locate the only surviving copy of the *History of the Diabolical Hand Bill* (Manchester, 1823). It is now in the Seligman Collection at the Columbia University Library. It is Place's copy, bound personally by him.

The pseudonym used on the first edition of the *Elements of Social Science* (1854) was not "Doctor of Medicine" (p. 313), but "Student of Medicine," inasmuch as that pioneer treatise on sex education was written when George Drysdale was still, if I mistake not, a medical student.

Apropos a statement by Field criticizing the American medical profession for its neglect of contraception, the editor appends a remark to the effect that Dr. Mensinga is an exception. Overlooking the fact that Mensinga was a German (which must have been known to the editor), one wonders why he was singled out when, in the last half century, no less than thirty German

physicians have published treatises on the *technique* of contraception. A still larger number have written affirmatively on the general theory (see a forthcoming pamphlet, *A Guide to Birth Control Literature*). German physicians have been well in advance of their American and English colleagues in encouraging the study and dissemination of knowledge regarding contraception.

It would be well if every college and university teacher of economics in America could read Field's essay on "The Place of Economic Theory in Graduate Work." Economics would then become less a theology and more a science. Field, a strong supporter of abstract theory when it did not degenerate into a mere vapid respect for authority, believed it was over-emphasized. It had degenerated into dogma, with the result that the universities were turning out safe, sane, and unoriginal economists who represented not scholarship but scholasticism. What potential originality the students might have was successfully knocked out of them by the theologians called economists. I believe Field wrote with Harvard in mind. He revolted; and refused to take the doctorate though he was a junior *Phi Beta Kappa* man and won his A.B. *summa cum laude*. Certainly the teaching of economics at some American institutions deserves the trouncing Field has meted out to it. Needless to say, every institution has teachers to whom the above observations would not be applicable. Some of the best passages in this chapter appear on page 339.

The catalogue of the library is a disappointment. I used to think that Professor Field had put together an important collection. The library now seems, though well-chosen, disappointingly small. This is the more unfortunate when it is realised that American university librarians tend to restrict their acquisitions to immediate and practical teaching needs rather than to present or future research needs; and that, as a consequence, they have succeeded with studied thoroughness in collecting very little that is worth while on the subjects Field was interested in.

The reader will derive an erroneous opinion of the reviewer's estimate of the value of this book, if he focuses upon the detailed criticisms that have preceded. What errors the book contains are those that the best of scholars fall into some time or other; they do not seriously mar either the usefulness or the permanent value of what is undoubtedly a notable contribution to demography.

NORMAN E. HIMES.

PSYCHOLOGY

Aldrich, C. R. *The Primitive Mind and Modern Civilization.* London, 1931. Kegan Paul. Pp. xvii+249+18. Price 18s.

MR. ALDRICH has written a very readable and, comparatively speaking, a sound and sober discussion of primitive mentality. I say 'comparatively speaking,' for this is a field in which authors are apt to indulge their speculative fancy without restraint. Mr. Aldrich rejects wholeheartedly the most celebrated of the fanciful systems, those of Freud and Levy Bruhl. The former is dismissed summarily, and to the refutation of the latter he devotes considerable space; perhaps not without reason, since the doctrines of the school seem still to enjoy a considerable vogue, in spite of their manifest absurdity. It is true that the author makes use of the expression 'collective representations,' but he waters it down to mean nothing more than "an orthodox conventional point of view." In rejecting the speculations of Freud and of the Durlubuin school, Mr. Aldrich is manifesting not his independence, but rather his discipleship to another great authority whose views are widely regarded as no less fanciful than those of Freud and Levy Bruhl, namely C. G. Jung.

The merit of the book is that it seeks to apply modern psychology to the problems of primitive society; its weakness is that it applies a very specialized psychology, the

"analytical psychology" of Dr. Jung, modified by the influence of Mr. Wilfred Trotter. Aldrich's psychology may be described as Jung-cum-Trotter; that is to say, he seeks to solve all the problems by aid of Jung's "collective Unconscious" (with its archetypes) and of Trotter's "herd instinct"; and, of course, working with two such powerful solvents, he finds no problem insoluble. Yet in so far as Trotter's solvent is used, the solutions are (as with Trotter) largely factitious. Thus, the main teaching of the book is summarized as follows:

"The race tends to progress from unconsciousness toward consciousness and during this progression three stages may be seen: first, an unconscious bi-morality, in which the primitive members of any social group co-operate instinctively; second, a period of savagery, in which the rise of egotistic tendencies requires that the group shall force the members to conform to a norm of conventional morality; and third, a stage . . . in which members of the group consciously co-operate for the common good, and consciously restrain their egotistic desires in order to do so. The psychic life history of every individual who reaches full individuality passes through these three phases of psychic development."

Now, allowing for the peculiar sense in which the word 'conscious' is used by the author (namely, as meaning clear, critical self-consciousness) this may be a true account. But the author claims to explain the succession of the three stages; and he explains the first stage by the dominance of the herd or social instinct (which, following Trotter, he makes responsible for every form of social activity); the second stage by the rise of self-consciousness; the third by the renewed dominance of the herd instinct, *in spite of* further accentuation of self-consciousness and individuality. The implication would seem to be that in the third stage of racial and individual development the 'herd instinct' somehow and for some obscure reason becomes very much